

LABOUR DEPARTMENT

The 4th March, 1986

No. 9/7/86-6Lab./1252.- In pursuance of the provisions of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, (Central Act No. XIV of 1947) the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of Haryana Roadways, Sirsa.

BEFORE SHRI B.P. JINDAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, ROHTAK

Reference No. 158 of 82

Between

SHRI JAGDISH CHANDER, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF HARYANA ROADWAYS, SIRSA

Shri S.S. Gupta, A.R. for the workman.

Shri V.K. Kohli, A.R. for the management.

AWARD

1. In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana, referred the following dispute, between the workman Shri Jagdish Chander and the management of M/s. Haryana Roadways, Sirsa, to this Court, for adjudication-- vide Haryana Government Gazette Notification No. 1D/HSR/44/82/35951, dated 3rd August, 1982 :--

Whether the termination of service of Shri Jagdish Chander was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

2. After receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared. The case of the workman is that he was employed with the respondent as a Conductor for the last about twelve years and all through his work and conduct has been satisfactory and that the respondent choose to terminate his services w.e.f. 25th November, 1981 on the ground that the workman remained absent from duty without leave from 6th June, 1981 onwards. Inter alia, it is alleged that the son of the petitioner fell ill and was under treatment in the Jind Eye Hospital, Hissar for 1½ months and for that reason the petitioner applied for leave from 6th June, 1981 onwards, but no intimation was sent to him regarding acceptance or non-acceptance of his leave petition and so, the petitioner presumed that the leave has been sanctioned and that on 20th June, 1981 when the petitioner approached the respondent to join his duties alongwith the medical certificate of his son, he was not allowed to do so. It is also alleged that before passing the order of termination, no reasonable opportunity was given to him of being heard and so, his termination falls squarely within the ambit of term "retrenchment" as defined in section 2(00) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter referred to as the Act). So, he has prayed for reinstatement with continuity of service and full back wages.

3. In the reply filed by the respondent, preliminary objections taken are that no cause of action has accrued in favour of the petitioner and that the reference is not maintainable and that the claim is pre mature. On merits, it is denied that any application for extension of leave was received and that the respondent has been sending notices to the petitioner to join his duties but he did not turn up and so the respondent was constrained to issue a proclamation in the newspaper Hindi Milap dated 27th October, 1981, but even then, the petitioner did not turn up and hence his services were terminated.

4. On the pleadings of the parties, the following issues were framed on 9th February 1983 :--

1. Whether the reference is not maintainable as alleged in the preliminary objection?
2. Whether the termination of service of Shri Jagdish Chander was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

5. Both the parties were allowed to produce their evidence. The petitioner himself appeared as WW-1 and the management examined MW-1 Shri Shyam Wadhwa, clerk, MW-2, Shri Kewal Krishan Inspector and MW-3 Shri Shiv Ram Sharma.

6. Learned Authorised Representatives of the parties heard.

Issue No. 1 :

The learned Authorised Representative of the respondent did not press this issue and rightly so, because there is no question of this claim being not maintainable, because the petitioner has challenged his

termination, which is not denied by the respondent. Even if no appeal was filed by him against the order of termination to the State Transport Controller, Haryana, Chandigarh, even then, this claim cannot be held to be premature.

Issue No. 2 :

8. On this issue the respondent must succeed, because the respondent did all it could do to procure the presence of the petitioner when he over stayed his leave after 5th June, 1981. The petitioner proceeded on leave on 31st May, 1981 upto 5th June, 1981 but he overstayed and did not resume his duties inspite of numerous notices and even a proclamation in the newspaper Hindi Milap dated 27th October, 1981. The case of the petitioner is that on 6th June, 1981 he sent an application for extension of leave upto 21st June, 1981 and when he went to resume his duties on 22nd June, 1981, he was not allowed to do so. He further stated that his son was admitted to the Jindal Eye Hospital, Hissar and as such, he was forced to apply for extension of leave. The question would be as to whether ever stay of the petitioner beyond the sanctioned period of leave was justified or not. The petitioner at the relevant time was posted at Sub Depot Mandi Dabwali of Sirsa Depot of the respondent. The distance between Hissar and Dabwali is about 150 Kilometers. The son of the petitioner recovered from his illness at best by 20th June, 1981, so there was no justification for the petitioner to have remained absent from his duties till his termination. Even if, it be believed that the petitioner had applied for extension of leave through an application on 6th June, 1981, the date on which, his sanctioned leave period expired, even then, he was not justified in presuming that since no intimation has been received from the respondent regarding acceptance or rejection of his leave application and not to make enquiries from the respondent regarding the fate of the application. He allowed five long months to expire and woke up only when the order of termination was passed against him and in the mean time the respondent had sent notices in writing to the petitioner at the address available with it and when it failed to procure the presence of the petitioner, it rightly sent for proclamation in the newspaper, directing the petitioner to resume his duties within seven days but even then, the petitioner did not turn up. In this situation, the respondent was fully justified in presuming that the petitioner was not interested in the job he was holding. On behalf of the petitioner Shri Gupta his learned Authorised Representative forcefully contended that no reasonable opportunity was given to the petitioner by the respondent before passing the order of termination and in support of his plea he cited AIR 1971 S.C. 1409, *Deokinandan Prasad Versus The State of Bihar and others* and 1978 LLJ (I) 459 between *Ahmedabad Advance Mills Company Ltd., and Sunderbhai Budhabhai*. In the Supreme Court authority cited above, it was not a case of over stay of leave but the petitioner was embroiled in a controversy with the respondent regarding his seniority. The petitioner expressed his readiness and willingness to work in the senior post but the respondent did not allow him to join his duties, so, it was not a case where the petitioner was absent from duties of his own. Similarly in the other authority cited on behalf of the petitioner, the petitioner in that case was absent from duty for reasons beyond control as he had been lodged in Jail after being booked for an offence of murder. In the present case, the petitioner remained absent from his duty of his own. He even did not make any enquiry from the respondent regarding the fate of his application for extension of leave upto 20th June, 1981. He remained absent till the date of termination. The management did all it could do to procure the presence of the petitioner. So much so even a proclamation was issued in the newspaper to procure his presence but the petitioner did not turn up to resume his duties. Under these circumstances, the order of termination was legal and lawful and it cannot be held that the same was passed without giving a reasonable opportunity to the petitioner of being heard. Under these circumstances, there is no difficulty in holding that the order of termination was fully justified and as such, this issue is answered in favour of the management.

9. Now, the question would be as to whether any interference with the order of termination is called for under section 11-A of the said Act. On behalf of the petitioner it was pleaded that the petitioner had put in more than eleven years of service with the respondent, on the date, demand notice dated 18th March, 1982 was raised by him. Though negligent, harsh penalty of termination was meted for. It was also prayed on behalf of the petitioner that employment opportunities in India are hard to come-by and to throw a bread earner out of employment would visit his family with serious consequences. Further more, the petitioner is aged about forty years and at this age he will find it difficult to procure any alternative employment. In view of these circumstances, this Court also feels that the extreme penalty of termination is glaringly disproportionate in relation to the proven mis-conduct of the petitioner. But at the same time, the petitioner cannot be allowed to bag the back wages for the period he remained out of employment. Allowing back wages to him would amount to putting premium on his proved mis-conduct and burdening the respondent with un-called for financial hardship. So, the petitioner is ordered to be reinstated but without back wages or any incidental benefits for the said period. Further he shall not be entitled to any benefit of previous service. He shall further loose with cumulative effect any increment he would have earned in case, he had remained in continuous employment during the period of absence i.e. from the date of termination till the date of reinstatement, which shall be done after one month of the publication of the award. The reference is answered and returned accordingly with no order as to cost.

Dated 15th January, 1986.

B. P. JINDAL,

Presiding Officer,

Labour Court, Rohtak,
Camp Court, Sirsa.

Endst No. 158-82/174, dated 3rd February, 1986.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

B. P. JINDAL,

Presiding Officer,

Labour Court, Rohtak,
Camp Court, Sirsa.

No. 9/7/86-6Lab./1253 — In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947) the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of (i) State Transport Controller, Haryana, Chandigarh (ii) General Manager, Haryana Roadways, Bhiwani.

BEFORE SHRI B.P. JINDAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, ROHTAK

Reference No. 47 of 1984

between

SHRISHAMSHER SINGH, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF (i) STATE
TRANSPORT CONTROLLER, HARYANA, CHANDIGARH (ii) GENERAL MANAGER,
HARYANA ROADWAYS, BHIWANI

Representative.

Shri S.S. Gupta, A.R. for the workman.

Shri Vijay Vir Singh, A.R. for the management.

AWARD

1. In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute, between the workman Shri Shamsher Singh and the management of (i) State Transport Controller, Haryana, Chandigarh (ii) General Manager, Haryana Roadways, Bhiwani, to this Court for adjudication, — vide Haryana Government Gazette Notification No. 14252-58, dated 5th April, 1984.

Whether the termination of services of Shri Shamsher Singh is justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

2. After receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared. The case of the petitioner is that he was employed as a Service Station Incharge with effect from 17th July, 1980 and his candidature was sponsored by the Employment Exchange and his posting was against existing vacancy but the respondent choose to terminate his services unlawfully with effect from 9th February, 1983 on the pretext that a candidate selected by the Subordinate Services Selection Board was to be appointed. So, he has alleged that his termination of service amounts to "retrenchment" as defined in section 2(60) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter referred to as the Act), which attracts the mandatory provisions of section 25-F of the said Act. So, he has prayed for reinstatement with continuity of service and full back wages.

3. In the reply filed by the respondent, the claim has been contested on many grounds. Preliminary objections taken are that this Court has no jurisdiction to try the present reference and further more the petitioner is not a "workman" as defined in section 2(s) of the said Act and the order of termination passed by the State Transport Controller, Haryana, Chandigarh is legal and binding upon the petitioner, because his services were terminated as per the stipulations in the order of appointment. On merits, it is alleged that the petitioner was appointed on *ad hoc* basis for a period of six months or till the posting of a regular candidate selected by the Subordinate Services Selection Board and the petitioner was never appointed against a permanent vacancy as alleged.

4. On the pleadings of the parties, the following issues were settled for decision by me on 22nd January 1985 :-

1. Whether the applicant is not a workman ?
2. Whether this Court has no jurisdiction to decide the controversy in hand ?
3. Whether the reference is bad in law ?
4. Whether the termination of services of Shri Shamsher Singh is justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?
5. The management examined MW-1 Shri Balwant Singh, Accountant, office of the State Transport Controller, Haryana, Chandigarh and the workman appeared as his own witness as WW-1.
6. Heard.

Issue Nos. 1, 2 and 3 :

7. These issues were not pressed on behalf of the respondent and rightly so, because the applicant can by no stretch of imagination be taken out from the purview of term "workman" as defined in section 2(s) of the said Act, because he was not performing any duties of any supervisory nature with any managerial powers. There is no question of jurisdiction of this Court being ousted to try the present reference, because the petitioner has challenged his termination on the ground that the same amounts to "retrenchment" and was brought about without payment of any retrenchment compensation or prior notice as envisaged in section 25-F of the said Act. No evidence has been led as to how this reference is bad in law. So, all these issues are answered against the management.

Issue No 4 :

8. Admittedly the petitioner had put in more than 240 days of actual work with the respondent during the last twelve calendar months from the date of his termination. So, in normal course the petitioner will be entitled to the protection of section 25-F of the said Act, because prior to his termination, the respondent did not pay any retrenchment compensation to him. The learned Authorised Representative of the respondent Shri Singh contended that since the termination of services of the petitioner was brought about because of the arrival of a candidate duly selected by the Subordinate Services Selection Board, so, his termination cannot be held to be "retrenchment". In support of his contention, he has placed strong reliance upon 1984 SIR(44) between Corporation of Cochin and others versus Jalaja and another. In this authority their Lordships of the Kerala High Court held that where a candidate selected by the Public Service Commission is appointed, discretion is available to the Court to award alternative relief to the employee sought to be ousted and the Court can in a suitable case, decline to grant relief of reinstatement. In this authority their Lordships relied upon judgments of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India reported in AIR 1976 S.C. 1111 between State Bank versus M.S. Money and AIR 1981 S.C. 422 between S. K. Verma versus Industrial Tribunal cum-Labour Court, New Delhi. In the later authority Hon'ble Mr. Justice O. Chinnappa Reddy, speaking for the Court observed as under :-

"Where legislation is designed to give relief against certain kinds of mischief, the Court is not to make inroads by making etymological excursions. 'void initio', invalid and inoperative, or call it what you will, the workman and the employer are primarily concerned with the consequence of striking down the order of termination of the services of the workman. Plain common sense dictates that the removal of an order terminating the services of workman must ordinarily lead to the reinstatement of the services of the workman. It is as if the order has never been and so it must ordinarily lead to back wages too. But there may be exceptional circumstances which make it impossible or wholly inequitable vis-a-vis the employer and workman to direct reinstatement with full back wages. For instance, the industry might have closed down or might be in severe financial doldrums the workmen concerned might have secured better or other employment elsewhere and so on. In such situations, there is a vestige of discretion left in the Court to make appropriate consequential orders. The Court may deny the relief of reinstatement where reinstatement is impossible because the industry has closed down. The Court may deny the relief of award of full back wages where that would place an impossible burden on the employer. In such and other exceptional cases the Court may award the relief but, ordinarily the relief to be awarded must be reinstatement with full back wages. That relief must be awarded where no special impediment in the way of awarding the relief is clearly shown. True, occasional hardship may be caused to an employer but we must remember that more often than not, comparatively for greater hardship is certain to be caused to the workmen if the relief is denied than to the employer if the relief is granted".

9. Mr. Justice Pathak agreeing added thus :—

“Ordinarily a workman who has been retrenched in contravention of the law is entitled to reinstatement with full back wages and that principle yields only where the justice of the case in the light of the particular facts indicates the desirability of a different relief.

10. In the present case, I see no impediment of the petitioner being granted the relief of reinstatement, because in the respondent roadways there are many depots spread out throughout the State of Haryana and it should not be difficult for the roadways to adjust the petitioner in any of those depots where ordinarily post of Service Station Incharge is available. So, ratio of the authority referred on behalf of the respondent is not applicable to the facts of the present case. Furthermore, Hon'ble Supreme Court in 1985 Lab. I.C. 1733 between H.D. Singh versus Reserve Bank of India and another in para number 9 of the judgement quoted provisions of section 2(ra) which contains a list of unfair labour practice as given to fix schedule of the said Act. The said provisions reads as under :—

“To employ workmen as ‘badlis’, casuals or temporaries and to continue them as such for years, with the object of depriving them of the status and privileges or permanent workmen”.

11. Making their observations on the said provisions their Lordships observed as under :—

“We have no option but to observe that the bank, in this case, has indulged in methods amounting to unfair labour practice. The plea that the appellant was a badli worker also has to fail”.

12. So, there is no escape from the conclusion that the conduct of the respondent in extending the tenure of the employment of the petitioner in dribblets as is evident from the copy of the orders Exhibit M-1, M-2, M-3 and M-4 clearly falls within the ambit of term ‘unfair labour practice’ and so, the petitioner deserves relief of reinstatement, which in this case cannot be declined.

13. In the light of my foregoing discussion, the petitioner is ordered to be reinstated with continuity of service and full back wages. Full back wages are being awarded because the petitioner raised the present demand notice within barely six months of his termination. The reference is answered and returned accordingly with no order as to cost.

Dated : 31st January, 1986.

B. P. JINDAL,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Rohtak.

Endorsement No. 47-84/175, dated 3rd February, 1986.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

B. P. JINDAL,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Rohtak.

No. 9/7/86-6Lab./1254.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of Haryana Roadways, Rohtak.

BEFORE SHRI B. P. JINDAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, ROHTAK

Reference No. 217 of 1982

between

SHRI KRISHAN LAL, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF THE HARYANA
ROADWAYS, ROHTAK

Present.—

Shri S.S. Gupta, A.R. for the workman.
Shri S.C. Singla, A.R. for the management.

AWARD.

1. In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana, referred the following dispute, between the workman Shri Krishan Lal and the management of the Haryana Roadways, Rohtak, to this Court, for adjudication,—vide Haryana Government Gazette Notification No. ID/RTK/160/81/51189, dated 17th November, 1982 :—

Whether the termination of service of Shri Krishan Lal was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

2. After receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared. The case of the petitioner is that he was employed with the respondent as a Conductor since 12th May, 1971 and that the respondent chose to terminate his services on 10th December, 1975 on the basis of trumped up charges, in which, a farce of enquiry, was held and on the basis of the enquiry findings an illegal and unlawful order of termination was passed. So, he has prayed for reinstatement with continuity of service and full back wages.

3. In the reply filed by the respondent, preliminary objections taken are that the services of the petitioner were terminated after a regular and proper domestic enquiry was held, in which, the workman was given full opportunity of participation and that before making the present reference, the appropriate authority did not give myany opportunity of hearing to the respondent and so, the reference is bad in law. *Inter alia* it is pleaded that the respondent has since lost confidence in the workman. On merits, reply runs on the same line and as such, I need not suffer repetition.

4. On the pleadings of the parties, the following issues were settled for decision on 6th April, 1983 :—

1. Whether the domestic enquiry conducted by the management is fair and proper ? If so, to what effect ?
2. Whether the management has lost confidence in the workman ?
3. Whether the reference is bad in view of the preliminary objection No. 3 of the Written Statement ?
4. Whether the termination of service of Shri Krishan Lal was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

5. The management examined MW-1 Shri Jawala Parshad Sharma, Traffic Manager, MW-2 Shri Kuldeep Singh, Traffic Manager, MW-3 Shri Pawan Kumar, Clerk, MW-4 Shri Kamlesh Chander, Assistant, office of the Labour Commissioner, Haryana, Chandigarh. The workman appeared as his own witness as WW-1.

6. Heard.

Issue No. 1

7. To prove this issue, the management examined MW-1 Shri Jawala Parshad Traffic Manager, who conducted the domestic probe against the petitioner. He stated that the enquiry proceedings were conducted in the presence of the petitioner, who was given full opportunity of participation and that the statement of witnesses of the management were recorded in the presence of the petitioner, who was given opportunity of full cross-examination and that thereafter the petitioner was given an opportunity of producing his defence. MW-2 Shri Kuldeep Singh, Traffic Manager, who took over the enquiry proceedings after transfer of Shri Jawala Parshad Sharma MW-1. He stated that the petitioner produced one witness in defence and thereafter to he gave his findings Ex.M-7 and sent the same to the General Manager roadways. MW-3 Shri Pawan Kumar, Clerk, who stated that a complaint Ex. MW-3/1 was received against the petitioner on the basis of which, charge-sheet Ex. MW-3/2 and gist of allegations Ex. MW-3/3 were given to the petitioner, who filed a reply Ex. MW-3/4 and thereafter the General Manager appointed Enquiry Officer,—vide his order Ex. MW-1 and thereafter on receipt of the report of the Enquiry Officer, final show cause notice Ex. MW-3/5 was given to the petitioner alongwith the copy of the findings of the Enquiry Officer. Reply given by the petitioner is Ex. MW-3/6 and thereafter the petitioner was given an opportunity of personal hearing and the order of termination was passed by Shri S.K. Sharma, General Manager, who has since died. He further stated that during the tenure of his employment thirteen increments of petitioner were stopped with cumulative effect for various acts of omissions and commissions.

8. On the other hand, initially the petitioner stated that no enquiry was held against him but later on corrected himself and stated that a domestic probe was held but on the basis of trumped up charges. He further stated that his previous record is blemishless.

9. The learned Authorised Representative of the respondent was right in contending that the enquiry proceedings were held in accordance with the settled principles of natural justice, because the petitioner not only participated in the enquiry proceedings as is proved from the statement of MW-1 Shri Jawala Parshad and MW-2

Shri Kuldeep Singh, who both held the domestic probe but he also choose to produce evidence in defence. Furthermore, he was given an opportunity of personal hearing by Shri S.K. Sharma the then General Manager since dead, who after considering the past record of the petitioner passed the order of termination. The petitioner is a brazen liar when he stated that no probe was held against him or the same was held on the basis of trumped up charges. So, this Court cannot buy arguments that the domestic probe was not held in accordance with the principles of natural justice or the Enquiry Officer was biased against the petitioner or that they committed any irregularity in conducting the enquiry proceedings. So, this issue is answered in favour of the management.

Issue No. 2

10. The learned Authorised Representative of the respondent was justified in contending that the respondent roadways has since lost confidence in the workman, who has been found guilty of various acts of omissions and commissions previous to the one which lead to his termination. Under these circumstances, the respondent was justified in contending that it has lost confidence in the petitioner, whose reinstatement will encourage him to indulge in such acts in future also.

Issue No. 3

11. To prove this issue, the respondent examined Shri Kamlesh Chander, Assistant, office of the Labour Commissioner, Haryana, Chandigarh as MW-4. He stated that on the demand notice raised by the workman dated 18th July, 1981, the Government of Haryana declined to make a reference to the Labour Court, photocopy of the rejection order is Ex-MW-4/A. The workman filed an appeal against this order to the Secretary Government of Haryana, which was also rejected,—*vide* order Ex. MW-4/3, but the workman again filed an appeal before the Labour Minister, Government of Haryana, regarding this appeal no notice was given to the management by the office and the same was rejected,—*vide* order Ex. MW-4/C. The workman again filed a representation before the Labour Commissioner, Haryana, upon which, the Labour Minister, Haryana *suo-moto* passed an order for referring the matter to the Labour Court for adjudication, but before that no notice was sent to the respondent or any comments were called for. The learned Authorised Representative of the respondent was right in contending that the Government of Haryana was not justified in making a reference to the Labour Court for adjudication without hearing the respondent, which, in this case was not done. So, order passed by the Government runs counter to the law laid down in 1983 Vol. 16, Lab. I.C page 223 between M/s. Escorts Limited, Faridabad v/s. Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad and others. It is a full Bench authority of the Hon'ble High Court of Punjab and Haryana, in which, their Lordships categorically concluded as under :

"In the light of the aforesaid discussion the answer to the question posed at the outset is rendered in the affirmative and it is held that the rule of *audi alteram partem* is attracted to the exercise of power a second time under S.10(1) of the Act whilst referring the matter for adjudication after the same had been rejected earlier. Applying the above the finding of the Tribunal of Issue is patently illegal and is hereby quashed.

12. So, there is no scope for controversy that this reference is bad in law and as such, this issue is answered against the workman.

Issue No. 4

13. In the light of my decisions on issues No. 1 and 2 the order of termination was justified.

14. In the light of my foregoing discussion, this reference fails and as such, the same is dismissed and answered accordingly with no order as to cost.

Dated 23rd January, 1986.

B. P. JINDAL

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Rohtak.

Endorsement No. 217-82/176, dated 3rd February, 1986.

Forwarded (four copies), to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments Chandigarh, under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

B. P. JINDAL,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Rohtak.